

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.251
24 March 1966

ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 24 March 1966, at 9 a.m.

Chairman:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL

(Sweden)

LIBRARY
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 7 1966

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

cdc.66-286

66-12936

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO
Mr. G. de CARVALHO SILOS
Mr. D. SILVEIRA da MOTA

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. D. POPOV
Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E. L. M. BURNS
Mr. S. F. RAE
Mr. C. J. MARSHALL
Mr. P. D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK
Mr. T. LAHODA
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. L. CEBIS

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ABERRA
Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. V. C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K. P. LUKOSE
Mr. K. P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. G. P. TOZZOLI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. G. O. IJEWERE
Mr. O. O. ADESOLA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI
Mrs. H. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. N. ECOBESCU
Mr. C. UNGUREANU
Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. I. VIRGIN
Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. A. A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. O. A. GRINEVSKY
Mr. I. M. PALENYKH

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. A. A. SALAM

United Kingdom:

Sir Harold BEELEY
Miss E. J. M. RICHARDSON

United States of America:

Mr. A. S. FISHER
Mr. C. H. TIMBERLAKE
Mr. L. D. WEILER
Mr. D. S. MACDONALD

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): I declare open the two hundred and fifty-first plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is now my duty to introduce to the members of the Committee the newly-appointed representative of the Soviet Union to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Alexei Alexandrovich Roshchin, who is now sitting beside me. Mr. Roshchin is not a newcomer to disarmament. Those who have been working on this problem for a long time came to know him well both in London and in the work of the Ten-Nation Sub-Committee, as well as in the Ten-Nation Committee, the Eighteen-Nation Committee and the General Assembly, and generally speaking in connexion with all events and measures having any bearing on disarmament.

I think, therefore, that you will all find it very easy to work with Ambassador Roshchin, just as I have found it easy to work with you. I am very grateful to you all for this; and I should like to wish the Committee the success it so badly needs in its work. I should like to conclude on this note, and to thank all the members of the Committee for their co-operation and the goodwill they have shown me. I leave Geneva with a feeling of satisfaction so far as my personal relations with the representatives in the Eighteen-Nation Committee are concerned, though not of course so far as concerns the results of our work. I should also like to inform you that I have received a new appointment which will be announced in due time, and that this is the reason why I am leaving the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I know that Ambassador Tsarapkin must leave us very soon to take a plane, and I shall therefore be brief.

As co-Chairman, I should like to wish him a good journey to Moscow and a fruitful stay there. We shall always be happy to see him again, for we know him as an able and dedicated representative of his country and a distinguished co-Chairman of our Committee. We wish him every success in his future endeavours, which I hope will be directed towards the easing of international tension and the attainment of significant new agreements on arms limitation and disarmament.

At times, of course, there have been disagreements between Ambassador Tsarapkin and the United States delegation; but we know him and respect him as a capable and careful representative of his country's position. I should like to add a personal

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

observation, if I may. We know him and respect him as a sincere advocate of the improvement of international relations and the reduction of the dangers of war through progress in the field of disarmament.

At the same time, as co-Chairman, I should like to welcome our old colleague Ambassador Roshchin. Ambassador Tsarapkin drew attention to Ambassador Roshchin's experience in disarmament matters. We are all aware of that experience and of his skill. As we know, he has participated in disarmament negotiations in London during the five-Power Sub-Committee meetings, in Washington and in Moscow during the negotiations of the McCloy-Zorin agreements, and here in Geneva. It is a pleasure to have him with us; but that pleasure is mixed with sadness at saying au revoir to an old friend.

Mr. GOMEZ ROBLED0 (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): Although I am well aware of the limited time at our disposal, I should like, on behalf of the eight delegations of the non-aligned countries, who have done me the honour of asking me to speak for them, to thank Ambassador Tsarapkin for his co-operation in the long period during which he has headed the Soviet delegation to our Committee. We shall always remember the numerous and distinguished qualities which he displayed -- his brilliant intelligence, his skill in debate, his wide knowledge and experience of international affairs, his constant devotion to disarmament problems and, last but certainly not least, his unfailing courtesy to us all. I am sure that Ambassador Tsarapkin is well aware of our affection and sincerity in wishing him the success he fully deserves in his new duties. On behalf of the delegations of the non-aligned countries, we would ask him to accept our best wishes for the future.

We also have great pleasure in welcoming the new representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Roshchin.

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): I want to add a brief note to the statements just made, and to sum them up in a vote of thanks to Mr. Tsarapkin from all of us in this Committee. He has certainly been a pillar of the Committee. I should like to thank him, perhaps more specifically in his personal capacity, for the very congenial way in which he has represented the spirit of this Committee. At the same time, we welcome Ambassador Roshchin.

Mr. LUKANOV (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, Alexei Alexandrovich Roshchin is known to many of us. We extend to him a hearty welcome and are glad of the opportunity to work with him. But Semyon Konstantinovich Tsarapkin, on the other hand, is leaving us; and we are glad of the opportunity to give him our very best wishes. We are convinced that, wherever he is, he will stand up for the peaceful policy of his Government and the whole socialist camp in favour of disarmament, international co-operation, and peaceful co-existence. With all our hearts we wish him the best of success.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): Since my time is limited because I have to catch my plane, I should like to thank all my friends and all the members of the Committee warmly and cordially for the friendly feelings they have expressed to me, and for their good wishes. Since I cannot go round the table, I will shake hands with our respected Chairman and so take leave of you all.

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): The Committee will now proceed with its discussion.

Mr. CORREA do LAGO (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation listened with the greatest interest to the statement made to this Committee on 22 March (ENDC/PV.250) by the representative of the United States in introducing amendments (ENDC/152/Add.1) to the United States draft treaty on non-proliferation (ENDC/152). My delegation is carefully studying that statement and the amendments.

In its intervention of 1 March the Brazilian delegation stated (ENDC/PV.244, p.16) that an agreement to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be conceived and fashioned as part of a programme. We maintained that such a programme was called for in order to bring about a first and highly significant step toward general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and, by the same token, to foster the process of the social and economic development of the developing countries.

In putting forth that suggestion my delegation attempted to outline an organic approach to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons -- an approach which, to our mind, is commensurate with the historical dimensions of a treaty designed to put an end to the menace of the spread of nuclear weapons. We are convinced that an

(Mr. Correa do Lago, Brazil)

agreement on non-proliferation should, as a matter of necessity, contemplate an acceptable balance of obligations on the part of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers; we are also convinced that by taking a decision on a programme of related measures the Conference would be availing itself of an opportunity to render the non-proliferation treaty as valid, as objective and as enduring as possible.

Of course our main concern here is and must be the problems of disarmament and world security. No one denies, however, the close link between world security and social progress. Thus our endeavours could go one step further, and seek to make the treaty on non-proliferation a stepping-stone on the path to the promotion of better standards of life for all peoples.

The debate in our Committee has only strengthened our feeling that this is a course we may very well pursue in order to achieve maximum results when dealing with the issue of non-proliferation. In this connexion, perhaps I am be allowed to repeat to my colleagues that my delegation is quite aware that it would not be possible to tie the signature of a non-proliferation treaty to the implementation of the four-point programme of related measures I have presented here (ENDC/PV.244, p.17). Nothing could be further from our minds than to minimize or disregard the dramatic urgency of the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons. What we propose to do is to focus nuclear disarmament from the point of view of a non-nuclear Power which is also a developing country.

In connexion with the programme we have suggested, we noted with keen interest the statement made on 10 March (ENDC/PV.247) by the representative of Sweden, as well as her commendable efforts towards making headway on some measures where a greater harmony of interests appears to prevail. My delegation finds much merit in what she had to say about freezing the production of materials for weapons purposes. An obligation to refrain from or to cease forthwith such production, devolving on nuclear and non-nuclear weapon countries alike, if not itself a provision of a non-proliferation treaty, as suggested by the representative of Sweden (*ibid.*, p.14), should most certainly be covered in a programme of related measures. Moreover, that obligation would undoubtedly open wide new vistas, combining its salutary effect on the political climate of the world with implicit evidence of the preparedness of the super-Powers to divert part of their resources to development programmes.

(Mr. Correa do Lago, Brazil)

On the same line of thought, my delegation listened with the utmost attention to the proposal made on 8 March by the representative of the United States, Mr. Fisher, on the transfer of a certain quantity of fissionable material contained in nuclear weapons to peaceful uses under international safeguards (ENDC/PV.246, pp.33 et seq.). As we see it, proposals of this nature, besides being non-proliferation measures, would above all harness for the benefit of mankind energies hitherto intended for its destruction.

The Brazilian delegation was very gratified to hear on 10 March the eloquent words used by Mr. Cavalletti in envisaging the establishment of a specific link between assistance to developing countries and the application of financial resources freed through disarmament measures. My delegation has consistently shown great interest in this matter. The representative of Italy has rendered the Conference a great service by bringing out in such cogent form and within the context of a non-proliferation treaty our obligations toward the welfare of men throughout the world. He stated:

"The essential point in our opinion is that it should be regarded as a legal duty, or at least as a very strict moral duty, that any initial collateral disarmament measures concurred should bring immediate relief to the needs of various countries on the basis of a pre-established system." (ENDC/PV.247, p.40)

We could not agree with him more. On several occasions, in this Committee and elsewhere, Brazil has sought to give concrete form to the awareness of the peoples of the world of the intimate relationship between peace and social progress. Indeed, the promotion of economic and social development is at the root of the maintenance of international peace and security. That is why we suggested in our speech of 1 March (ENDC/PV.244, p.16) a programme of related measures comprising the channelling to the developing countries of at least part of the savings stemming from disarmament steps. We said that a declaration of intention covering the suggested programme would be a positive political accomplishment (ibid., p.17). It occurs to me that this declaration of intention might very well be the place where the Italian proposal could be made to fit in.

In taking this stand, my delegation is encouraged by the fact that the utilization of resources liberated by disarmament for the granting of economic assistance to developing countries is one of those principles which seem to meet with

(Mr. Correa do Lago, Brazil)

the favourable response of the Committee. To quote only one recent statement thereon, the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Cernik in his intervention of 10 March (ENDC/PV.247, p.31) mentioned that principle among the proposals the implementation of which his delegation would regard as an important step towards the solution of the questions before us.

My delegation is willing to co-operate in a common search for ways and means to attain the goals set out in this statement. It is our firm hope that we may report to the General Assembly positive results on the question of non-proliferation and at the same time convey to the United Nations recommendations of the Conference with regard to this no less constructive part of our mandate, as set forth in resolution DC/225 of the Disarmament Commission (ENDC/149).

Before concluding, I wish to extend to Mr. Roshchin my personal welcome as well as that of the Brazilian delegation.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): First of all I should like to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed towards Ambassador Tsarapkin, who has now left us, and to add my warm personal appreciation, which I would ask Ambassador Roshchin to convey to him. At the same time I should like to welcome Mr. Roshchin, who also is an old friend, at least of those of us who are disarmament veterans.

Before beginning my statement I should also like to thank Ambassador Correa do Lago very cordially for the support which he has given to the ideas reaffirmed by my delegation concerning the link to be established between disarmament, the savings to be made through disarmament, and the economic and social progress of all peoples. His support and that of the Brazilian delegation reinforce our efforts to reach a goal common to us all. Mr. Correa do Lago's contribution is very valuable, and I am sure that the Committee will accord it the importance which it deserves. I hope that the whole Committee will wish to subscribe to this declaration of intent to which he has just referred.

At our meeting of 22 March the Committee heard the statement of the United States representative, Mr. Fisher, who introduced and explained (ENDC/PV.250) the significance and value of the amendments which his delegation had made in its own draft treaty on non-proliferation (ENDC/152/Add.1). The reasons for these amendments and their scope are now, in our opinion, quite clear and do not require any further

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

explanation. Nevertheless, my delegation has asked for a hearing to express, as the United Kingdom delegation has already done (ENDC/PV.250, p.20), its full support of these amendments.

The draft treaty submitted by the United States delegation (ENDC/152), it will be recalled, was prepared with the participation and contribution of other Western delegations. The same is true of the amendments which complete and clarify the United States proposals.

I should now like to add a few brief comments concerning in particular the problem of non-proliferation with special reference to associations of States, as it now appears in the light of the amended United States proposals. This is a subject to which the delegation of the United Arab Republic has recently drawn this Committee's attention (ENDC/PV.245, pp.8, 9). The prohibition of all proliferation within the framework of an association of States which do not possess nuclear weapons should now be viewed in the context of the United States proposals from the point of view of a double limitation. The first limitation concerns the number of Powers possessing nuclear weapons, a number which may in no circumstances be increased. The second refers to the control of nuclear weapons as defined in the amendments: the right or ability to fire nuclear weapons without the concurrent decision of an existing nuclear weapon State. These two limitations taken together -- this double barrier -- restrict in a manner that is specific, categorical and without loop-holes, the nuclear capabilities of any future associations in such a way that non-proliferation is fully ensured.

As the United States representative, Mr. Fisher, stated during our meeting of 22 March:

(Spoke in English)

"This provision would bar any transfer of control of nuclear weapons to any association of States ... unless one of the members of the association was a nuclear weapon State and that member gave up its entire nuclear arsenal to the association." (ENDC/PV.250, p.10)

(Continued in French)

At the same meeting the United Kingdom representative, Lord Chalfont, interpreting the same amendment, quite rightly made the following statement:

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

(Spoke in English)

"... the reference to associations of non-nuclear States which is now added to the draft seems to me to meet any anxiety which may have been felt that a situation might conceivably arise at some future time when an association of non-nuclear States could have acquired control of nuclear weapons without infringing the treaty as it was drafted earlier. This possibility has now been closed". (ibid., p.20)

(Continued in French)

As was made clear by Lord Chalfont in his statement of 22 March, and as my delegation has also emphasized in a previous statement (ENDC/PV.236, p.8), a non-proliferation treaty neither can nor should undermine existing alliances, which are still necessary, despite the diminution of danger, to guarantee equilibrium and peace. As long as the process of general and complete disarmament has not made sufficient progress, this necessity continues to exist, not only for the security of Europe but also, since peace is indivisible, for that of the third world. It should not be forgotten that it is under the shelter of this equilibrium between East and West that the non-aligned countries have been able to maintain without danger their equidistant positions and to avoid threats to their independence and freedom.

Besides, a non-proliferation treaty cannot paralyse the aspirations existing in Western Europe -- and in my own country for one -- towards the achievement of a closer association and integration of European countries in all spheres. These tendencies answer to the requirements of a better balance in Europe and the world, of a consolidation of democracy on the European continent, of general economic and social progress and, in a word, of the needs of peace. I am speaking of that wave of opinion in favour of European integration and federation which swept in after the War and aroused so many hopes. These are currents of history which, despite difficulties, some of which unfortunately have occurred even quite recently, are in our opinion absolutely irresistible. My country remains attached to these ideals, which threaten no one and reflect a yearning for peace and a general improvement of life in Europe and elsewhere.

If the possibility of a truly-integrated European association is to be left open, it must be supposed that, if a European federation were formed, the nuclear weapon country or countries belonging to it would at a given moment become absorbed into that federation. We are talking here, of course, of a long-term

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

prospect, of the outcome of a process which has hardly begun. It may be that by then general and complete disarmament will have been accomplished so that the fate of the nuclear weapon members of the federation will present no problems. Or it may be that this will not have happened. It is for this reason that a non-proliferation treaty, in establishing final renunciations, should take into account this problem and leave the door open, while prescribing limits corresponding to the true aim of non-proliferation within the framework of associations of States as now defined by the United States amendments.

I should like to add a few words concerning the adoption in the United States amendments of the expression "non-nuclear weapon States" instead of "non-nuclear States". This is a change which my delegation accepts with particular satisfaction, for a distinction is thus introduced between nuclear Powers possessing a peaceful nuclear potential and States possessing nuclear weapons. This distinction is very appropriate. It would not be accurate, technically or even politically, to call "non-nuclear" those countries which possess peaceful nuclear installations, sometimes very large and well developed, for the simple reason that they have refrained from exploding bombs.

This is the category of States which, under a non-proliferation treaty, will be called upon to make the most substantial sacrifices. If a non-proliferation treaty were concluded, this category of States would have to accept, of course on an equal footing with the nuclear-weapon countries in regard to these countries' peaceful nuclear activities, the controls laid down to safeguard the commitment. Incidentally, this is the category of States which would be called upon first to agree to any nuclear moratorium. In short, the change in the wording of the United States draft treaty takes account of these realities and, in eliminating a source of ambiguity, recognizes a de facto situation which should be considered within the framework of any undertaking on non-dissemination.

I hope that the Soviet Union delegation will see no objection to accepting this amendment, as I also hope very sincerely that all the changes made in the United States draft treaty will facilitate agreement.

The Western delegations have shown their good will. They have drawn up amendments in order to take account of a number of comments which have been made here by other delegations, among them the Soviet delegation. That is clear proof of their

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

good will. Let the Soviet delegation in its turn present us with some amendments with the same intention as ours: that of meeting us halfway, of finding compromise solutions, and of not ignoring the difficulties and feelings of others.

The Soviet Union waited several months before submitting a counter-proposal (ENDC/164) to the United States draft treaty on non-proliferation (ENDC/152). I hope that this time it will make more haste in presenting us in turn with amendments to its draft treaty. We shall examine them with good will and most carefully. We shall certainly examine them more judicially than the Soviet Union delegation examined our amendments at our last meeting on 22 March (ENDC/PV.250); for, speaking to the Press only one hour after the submission to our Conference of the document containing the United States delegation's amendments (ENDC/152/Add.1), the Soviet delegation expressed a negative opinion about these. This haste, this lack of reflection, are very regrettable; and I hope that the Soviet delegation will think again, will recognize the merits of our amendments, and will formulate its new proposals with an open mind inspired by the real exigencies of peace.

Mr. DUMITRESCU (Romania) (translation from French): I should first of all like to associate myself with the expressions of respect and wishes of success to our former co-Chairman and head of the Soviet delegation, Ambassador Tsarapkin, who has left us only today. On behalf of the Romanian delegation I also extend a greeting and best wishes of success to Ambassador Roshchin, the new head of the Soviet delegation, who I am sure will spare no effort to ensure the success of our efforts.

The Romanian delegation considers that, through the procedure adopted at the beginning of our present session (ENDC/PV.235, p.11), a valuable exchange of views has been possible both on general and complete disarmament -- our Committee's main task -- and on various collateral measures of concern to the States participating in these negotiations. We have noted with interest the statements during our debates on the need not to lose sight of our main objective, which has been and still is general and complete disarmament, a step which under present circumstances is capable of bringing peace and security to all peoples.

The Committee has also given its attention to certain collateral measures aimed at reducing international tension, promoting confidence between States, and generally improving conditions for disarmament negotiations. In the Romanian delegation's opinion, steps such as the convening of a conference to sign an agreement prohibiting

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

the use of nuclear weapons, the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world, the withdrawal of all armed forces stationed in foreign territory, the abolition of military bases abroad, and others, should engage your Committee's particular attention.

I should like to take this opportunity of explaining the Romanian delegation's attitude to the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Tsarapkin, at our meeting on 17 February (ENDC/PV.241). I refer to the United States bomber which crashed in southern Spain with nuclear weapons on board. The Romanian delegation has several times stressed the danger to peace and security for all nations represented by the existence of military bases on the territory of certain foreign States. The accident at Palomares merely confirms afresh the urgent need to abolish these bases. We support the Soviet delegation's proposal that our Committee should issue an appeal for the immediate cessation of flights of aircraft carrying nuclear weapons beyond the limits of national frontiers (ibid., pp. 8, 9).

In one form or another, the measures I have just mentioned reflect the now generally-recognized need to eliminate the nuclear danger first and foremost by the complete destruction of all existing stocks of nuclear weapons and their vehicles. The Romanian delegation has already stated that it considers that the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and, as a step in that direction, an undertaking by the nuclear Powers not to be the first to use them, would be of capital importance in achieving this major objective. The outlawing of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear armaments and of any weapon of mass destruction by a solemn international instrument would be fully in keeping with the legal conscience of humanity, would help to improve the international political climate, and would reduce the danger of a devastating nuclear war which hangs over mankind today.

The Romanian delegation has already had occasion to express its opinion on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a subject on which discussion has been resumed by the Committee. We have followed with interest the views of the various members of the Committee, which seem to offer many enlightening suggestions and ideas concerning not only the goal at which an agreement of this kind should aim but also the content and nature of the obligations the parties should assume and the consequences and effects of such an agreement. Without attempting to elucidate all the material points which have emerged from these discussions, I should like to make a few brief remarks on certain aspects which have claimed our special attention.

(Mr. Dumitrescu, Romania)

First, we consider it necessary that the non-proliferation agreement should be viewed, not as an end in itself, but as an effective contribution towards achieving general disarmament, and above all nuclear disarmament. In our view, when judging a proposal we should consider the extent to which its adoption would contribute to halting the arms race and consolidating peace and security for all States; and it therefore seems natural to us that so many speakers should have stressed the necessary link between a non-proliferation agreement and a nuclear disarmament agreement.

The most direct and serious threat to the existence of a non-proliferation treaty lies, of course, in the presence and continual expansion of vast stocks of nuclear weapons. It has rightly been said that the existence of nuclear armaments is a major problem which the authors of a non-proliferation treaty cannot evade. Having regard to the position it has already defined (ENDC/PV.239), the Romanian delegation wishes to reiterate that in its view the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons must be organically interlinked with a series of measures designed to abolish the nuclear danger, ensure equal security for all States, and bring about general disarmament. It is essential, both in practice and in principle, that such an agreement should create a mutually-acceptable balance of obligations and liabilities between the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers if the safety of all nations is to be guaranteed. In our opinion, to prohibit the use of nuclear armaments and any weapon of mass destruction is one step which would satisfy this justifiable demand of all nations.

A leading place in our discussions has been given to the stipulation in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161) that the treaty should be void of any loop-holes for the proliferation, direct or indirect, of nuclear weapons in any form. In this connexion the delegations of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, as well as those of most of the non-aligned countries, have drawn attention to the Western plans for creating certain multilateral or Atlantic nuclear forces under NATO. As we have already stated, we are resolutely opposed to such schemes and to any other project directed towards the same end. We consider that this kind of action would adversely affect, not only relations between States in general, but also the negotiations taking place in this Committee.

The Romanian delegation wishes to state that it will continue, in company with other delegations, to contribute towards a constructive exchange of ideas and suggestions on the questions we are called upon to discuss in this Committee.

Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

Madam Chairman, Ambassador Tsarapkin has asked me to repeat his thanks for the appreciative remarks which you and the other members of the Committee have made about his work as representative of the Soviet Union. He has also asked me to thank all the members of the Committee and representatives of the Secretariat for meeting at a comparatively early hour at his request, to enable him to attend the first part of this meeting.

Since I am called upon to speak, Madam Chairman, I should like on my own behalf to thank you and the Committee members who have spoken at this meeting, as well as Ambassador Fisher, my co-Chairman and the United States representative, whom I have known and worked with for many years in this Committee.

I should also like to thank Ambassador Gomez Robledo, of Mexico, who, speaking on behalf of the non-aligned States, bade farewell to Mr. Tsarapkin and extended a welcome to me.

I have great pleasure in thanking Ambassador Iukanov, to whom I am bound by long friendship and our work together in this Committee and in a number of other international organizations, including the sessions of the General Assembly.

May I also thank Ambassador Correa do Lago, the Brazilian representative, for his warm words of appreciation to Mr. Tsarapkin and welcome to myself?

I have great pleasure in thanking Ambassador Cavalletti, of Italy, whom we have already met here in the Ten-Nation Committee in 1960 and in subsequent years in the Eighteen-Nation Committee. I have often had the pleasures of working with him in this Committee.

Permit me also, in conclusion, to thank Ambassador Dumitrescu of Romania, to whom I am bound by long and close friendship and by our work together in this Committee for many years.

I hope that I, like Ambassador Tsarapkin, will continue to co-operate with the members of the Committee in accomplishing the great and important task which lies before us.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 251st plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Mrs. Alva Myrdal, representative of Sweden.

"Statements were made by the Chairman and the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, Mexico, Bulgaria, Brazil, Italy and Romania.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 29 March 1966, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 10 a.m.

